

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/031,399	Applicant(s) SATO, KATSUJISA	
	Examiner Tianjie Chen	Art Unit 2656	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Tianjie Chen (Primary Examiner, PTO). (3) ____.
- (2) _____. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 6 and 34.


Identification of prior art discussed: US 6,493,308.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


TIANJIE CHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner explains that US 6,493,309 shows that the positioning unit is movable substantially vertically to the said drive unit (See US 6,493,308, column 6, lines 47-60), Applicant is advised to add more details structural limitations to distinguish the prior art, in which the user removes the disc tray from the tray housing section and moves it vertically to another position in the tray housing section. Claim 34 includes action limitation, therefore, cannot invoke 112 sixth paragraph.